# RECIPROCITY

Issue No. 1 August, 1971

Published By:
The New Science Advocates
P.O. Box 223
Watervliet, N. Y. 12189

TO INTERESTED PERSONS:

During the last year several of us interested in a serious study and evaluation of Dewey B. Larson's Reciprocal System of physical theory have begun contacting others of like disposition. Previously a number of us had been in direct correspondence with Mr. Larson.

On December 30, 1970, three of us met for a day in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in what may be considered the first Larsonian convention. Present were Dr. Douglas S. Cramer of General Electric (Schenectady), George W. Hancock of Marietta College (Ohio), and Dr. Paul F. deLespinasse of Adrian College (Michigan) and (temporarily) Harvard Law School. One result of that meeting is this news letter, RECIPROCITY.

## POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

The objective of RECIPROCITY will be to promote understanding and eventual acceptance of the reciprocal system of physical theory.

1. By reporting events and developments that have some significance in connection with the theory.
2. By reporting the activities of individuals who are working on extending the theoretical system to new fields, into greater detail, or to specific applications.
3. By calling attention to and commenting on publications concerning the reciprocal system or of interest in connection with it.
4. By publishing comments and suggestions from individuals interested in the theory and its applications.
5. By providing a clearing house for questions concerning the theory.
6. By publicizing forthcoming lectures or meetings (including regular meetings of various scientific societies) at which matters relevant to the reciprocal system will be, or can be, discussed.

## PUBLICATION ASSISTANCE

One of the principal obstacles standing in the way of any new system of thought is the reluctance of the journals in the field or fields affected to publish anything that conflicts with current dogma. This newsletter will therefore undertake to assist authors of works concerning the reciprocal system in whatever manner may be feasible. In conformity with this policy we are providing space in this issue for an announcement of a book recently published by one of the members of our organization, Ronald W. Satz of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. We have also reproduced a twenty page article by Professor Frank H. Meyer of Wisconsin State University (Superior) entitled "Time of Planetary Perihelion Motion", in which the predictions of the reciprocal system as to the magnitude of the perihelion precession are compared with those derived from general relativity. In view of the extent to which the perihelion precession is relied upon as the most important confirmation of relativity theory, Professor Meyer's findings are very significant. Copies of this paper will be supplied free of charge on request. Just check the coupon at the end of this newsletter and send it to us.

## GLEANINGS FROM THE LITERATURE

If the reciprocal system of theory is, as it is claimed to be, a true and accurate representation of the actual physical universe, it should ultimately, when fully developed, be able to account for *all* of the details of observed physical phenomena, as well as for those of the phenomena that have not yet been observed. Of course, the development of the new theory has not yet reached this highly advanced stage, but it has been carried far enough to provide the answers for a great many questions that have been sources of difficulty for conventional theory. It will therefore be interesting, and likewise significant, to extract from the scientific literature individual items that are readily explained by the new system, but are inexplicable, or even contradictory, in the context of previously existing thought.

A good example is provided by the reports of a recent series of observations by scientists from MIT and collaborating institutions which has thrown the whole question of the significance of spectral redshifts into confusion. One of the best discussions of this matter can be found in a long article by Dr. Peter Stubbs in the April 29, 1971 issue of the British journal *The New Scientist*. We recommend reading this article, which is quite candid about the predicament in which the astrophysicists now find themselves. Dr. Stubbs' concluding statement is as follows: "Unless the work Shapiro

reported contains an oversight, the red shift distance relation for quasars is a broken tool". As a related article in the May 13 issue of the same journal points out, this has caused "cosmic chaos". In striking contrast, the reciprocal system produces, from its basic postulates, a simple and straightforward explanation of the situation, described in detail in Larson's new book *Quasars and Pulsars.*

We will welcome suggestions from readers as to items of this nature that can appropriately be discussed in future issues. It is not necessary that they be confined to current work. Older observations that conventional theory is still unable to explain are equally pertinent. Many physical facts have been observed, reported, and then brushed aside and forgotten because they do not fit into the current structure of theory. If they are too important to be neglected entirely they are, as Fred Hoyle explained in connection with one such item, "passed over with little comment". Larson has discussed a considerable number of these recalcitrant physical facts in his books, and has shown that they can readily be explained on the basis of the reciprocal system. Undoubtedly there are a great many others waiting to be recognized.

## DO YOU HAVE A QUESTION?

As indicated in the statement of policies and objectives, we propose to set up a program under which questions with respect to the reciprocal system and its applications will be referred to qualified indivduals for answers. A few of those which are of the most general interest will be selected for publication in the newsletter. For this first issue, before the questions begin to come in to us, we have asked Mr. Larson to refer to his files and to give his answers to a couple of the most frequently asked questions. He reports that astronomical issues are now very much in the limelight, and two of the favorites are these:

Q: How can we distinguish a galaxy of anti-matter, or "cosmic matter" as you call it, from a galaxy of ordinary matter?

A.: We do not observe a galaxy of cosmic matter as a galaxy. The individual atoms of which it is composed are contiguous in time but widely dispersed in space, hence we who are localized in space encounter the galaxy not as an aggregate but as an occasional single atom, which we cannot identify as a part of a larger unit.

Q: What do we gain by substituting your explanation of the recession of the galaxies for the "Big Bang" hypothesis? Isn't the "Big Bang" in full agreement with the observations?

A: The "Big Bang" hypothesis is in agreement with what is known about the galactic recession phenomenon itself, but it has no relevance to anything else, and is usefulness is therefore severely limited. For instance, it gives us no hint of the important fact that the recession is a *general* characteristic of matter; that *all* material aggregates which are outside the gravitational limits of their neighbors are receding from them. Furthermore, it actually prevents its adherents from finding explanations for certain other observed items, such as the absence of quasar blueshifts (which is a complete mystery in the context of conventional theory). The reciprocal system, on the other hand, derives all of its explanations in all physical fields from the same basic premises, the postulated properties of space and time, and its explanation of the recession is consistent not only with what we know about the recession itself, but with established knowledge in all related fields.

Announcing: *The Unmysterious Universe,* An Introduction to D. B. Larson's New Unified General Theory, by Ronald W. Satz. This book is meant as an introduction and a supplement to Larson's work in which the author presents his understanding of the theory. The author does use quotations from Larson's books and letters and relies on them for a more complete discussion in some areas. However, one does benefit from *The Unmysterious Universe* in its independent discussion of many of the difficult concepts unique to Larson's theory, for example the relationship between clock space and co-ordinate space and their dimensionality. Using many diagrams to assist the reader, Mr. Satz has included the completed periodic chart of the material elements, chart of the theoretically allowable matter and anti-matter, the astrophysical consequences of the reciprocity between space and time as manifested in the cycle of the universe, and others. *The Unmysterious Universe* is a concise introduction to Larson's work and as such is ideal to lend friends who wish to know something about Larson's innovation. The 75 page book has an attractive paperback cover and easy to read print. It is available from The New Science Advocates for $2.25 (includes postage).

# JUST WHAT DO WE CLAIM?

*One of the results that will no doubt follow from the formation of the new organization and the establishment of this newsletter is a substantial increase in the number of presentations of the reciprocal theory or portions thereof to audiences of various kinds. We have therefore invited Mr. Larson to make some suggestions as to the handling of the subject matter. His comments follow.*

The task of presenting the case for a new system of thought is a difficult one at best, and in order that it may be successfully accomplished it is essential to confine the discussion to the specific points at issue, and to avoid being drawn into controversies regarding matters which, at least for the present, are irrelevant. This is particularly important because the principal interests of most of those to whom the presentation is addressed, the items that they will want to talk about, lie along the periphery of scientific knowledge, the scene of most current research activity, whereas the development of a new system of theory must necessarily begin with fundamentals, and in the early stages will not reach the outlying "fine structure" except in certain special cases. This point should be brought out early in the discussion in order to eliminate the necessity of giving a series of negative answers to questions on the order of "Does the theory explain thus-and-so?"

It should be emphasized that we do not claim that the reciprocal system *in its present stage of development* is ready to supply the explanations of all of these fine details, and the unavailability of any particular explanation thus has no relevance to the point now at issue. The question that is now up for consideration is whether the claims that we *do* make can be substantiated, and the only items that have any significance for present purposes are those that have some bearing on this issue. It is essential, therefore, that the claims which we are making on behalf of the reciprocal system be clearly and specifically defined. They can be expressed as follows:

I. The reciprocal system is a *general* physical theory, one that derives all of its conclusions in all physical fields from a single set of basic premises – the only such general physical theory that has ever been formulated.

II. Within the range of phenomena thus far covered in the development of the consequences of the fundamental postulates of the system, an area which includes the basic features of all of the major branches of physical science and a wide variety of subsidiary phenomena, all of the conclusions that are reached from the theory are consistent with the physical facts that have been definitely established by observation and measurement (although they do not necessarily agree with inferences from or extrapolations of those facts, nor with theories previously devised to explain the facts).

III. Because all conclusions are derived from the same basic premises, the entire structure of theory is a single integral unit that is not subject to modification or adjustment. Every comparison of theory with observation is therefore a test of the validity of the theoretical system as a whole. Thus each of the thousands of such tests that have already been made without finding a discrepancy has reduced the probability that a discrepancy will ever be found, and as matters now stand it is practically certain that the theoretical universe of the reciprocal system is a true and accurate representation of the actual physical universe.

All theories must begin with assumptions. Heretofore we have had no general physical theory. As one prominent physicist expresses it, we have had only a "a multitude of different parts and pieces that do not fit together very well". Each separate theory – each of the "parts and pieces" – has found it necessary to begin with assumptions about the particular field to which it applies. Thus theories of liquids are based on assumptions about liquids, theories of cosmic rays on assumptions about cosmic rays, theories of the structure of matter on assumptions about matter, and so on. A very significant feature of the reciprocal system is that it make no assumptions at all about these individual physical fields. It makes no assumptions about liquids, nor about cosmic rays, nor about matter. As stated in I, all of its conclusions about these phenomena are based entirely on the assumptions, or postulates, regarding the nature of space and time that constitute the foundation of the theoretical system. This is a very important point. The mere fact that the development of the consequences of a set of postulates with respect to *space and time* is able to arrive at specific conclusions about phenomena in all major fields of physical science is in itself a strong indication that the theoretical system thus derived is a true representation of the physical facts.

Claim II is simply a statement that the conclusions derived from the new theory are consistent with all established knowledge. These conclusions do conflict with many ideas now prevalent, including some generally accepted theories, but this again is irrelevant. Our claim is that the new theory is correct, not that it is

better than the theory of limited scope which is now accepted in the particular field under consideration. "Better" is a subjective concept that rests mainly on non-scientific criteria, and is wide open to differences of opinion. In order to present a clear-cut and conclusive case for the new theory it is advisable to stick to the objective facts specified in I and II and to avoid subjective issues.

Likewise there is nothing to be gained at the present time by any argument in support of the validity of Claim III. When we verify Claim II we automatically put the new system into a position where a careful and painstaking examination of the system and its potentialities by the scientific community is unavoidable. Inasmuch as we are aiming at nothing more than this modest objective for the present, the validity of Claim III is not now an issue, although it obviously will have considerable importance in the long run.

Dewey B. Larson

## LET US HEAR FROM YOU

By this time, a dozen years after the first publication of the fundamentals of the reciprocal system, there are a great many supporters of the new theory, and a great many more individuals who are favorably disposed toward it and wish to become better acquainted with it. But we are handicapped by being scattered throughout all parts of the world, and we have not had the advantage, except in some special cases, of being able to gather for group discussions. This publication is intended to assist in arranging such discussion meetings, and also to serve, in some degree, as a substitute for personal contact – something that will enable us to exchange ideas and pool our intellectual resources. The first issue is somewhat experimental, and we will welcome your comments as to editorial policies and content. We will also be glad to receive contributions for publication in future issues: short articles, letters on pertinent matters, or news items, including announcements of local meetings in which the reciprocal system will be involved. Please send all material to:

Dr. Douglas Cramer, Editor
RECIPROCITY
New Science Advocates
P.O. Box 223
Watervliet, N. Y. 12189

---

To: The New Science Advocates
P.O. Box 223
Watervliet, N. Y. 12189

Please send me

☐ a free copy of Professor Meyer's paper.

☐ a copy of **The Unmysterious Universe,** by Ronald W. Satz, for which I enclose $2.25.

Name _____

Address _____